



Review: [untitled]

Author(s): Lawrence A. Reid

Reviewed work(s):

Ilocano Dictionary and Grammar: Ilocano-English, English-Ilocano by Carl Ralph Galvez Rubino

Source: *Oceanic Linguistics*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (Jun., 2002), pp. 238-243

Published by: University of Hawai'i Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3623336>

Accessed: 03/12/2009 00:58

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=uhp>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of Hawai'i Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Oceanic Linguistics*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Book Reviews

Carl Ralph Galvez Rubino. 2000. *Ilokano Dictionary and Grammar: Ilokano-English, English-Ilokano*. PALI Language Texts, Department of Linguistics, University of Hawai'i. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. lxxxvi + 778 pp. ISBN 0-8248-2088-6. US\$34.00.

Among the Philippine languages, Ilokano is ranked third in terms of its number of mother-tongue speakers (probably over 8,000,000), yet there has never been a good, widely available dictionary of the language until now. The two major Ilokano-English dictionaries prior to this work (Vanoverbergh 1957, henceforth V, and Geladé 1993, henceforth G) were both published in the Philippines by Catholic Missionary Press and were based on an original Ilokano-Spanish dictionary (Carro 1888). All were written by missionary linguists primarily as aids to new missionaries beginning their work in the northern Philippines. The present work, prepared by a linguist with the broader community of scholars interested in the language in mind, as well as the needs of Ilokano language learners outside the Philippines, contains in addition to the approximately 20,000 headwords, a more sophisticated cross-referencing system than in earlier works, equivalent forms (not necessarily cognates) in Tagalog and other languages for many of the roots, an English index, and a short grammatical description. The appendix contains charts of grammatical forms, such as articles, pronouns, and demonstratives, as well as several charts listing verbal affixes. There are a few maps showing the northern Philippine provinces where most native Ilokano-speaking people live, and finally 46 (untranslated) Ilokano traditional songs, a number of the words of which cannot be found in the dictionary itself.

Although Rubino (henceforth R) states that he used the Vanoverbergh dictionary as a base for his own work, he notes that he has searched an extensive body of Ilokano literature, much of it appearing in the highly popular *Bannawag* and *Burnay* magazines, and his own body of spoken Ilokano data collected throughout the Ilokano-speaking region for new lexical material. However, most of the forms, both native and borrowed, appear in G, whose work was also available to R. Comparing some one thousand entries in R with those in G (which contains 18,500 main entries) from thirty randomly chosen pages, I was able to identify only about twenty-five entries that could be characterized as previously undescribed native Ilokano roots. In addition, there were a similar number of botanical or fish terms, apparently taken from older published materials on these topics, that were not in G.¹ Close to fifty entries not in G were derived forms of roots listed elsewhere in the dictionary. In addition, there were a dozen variant forms, several cross-references, and a half dozen terms identified as borrowed from Tagalog or other geographically adjacent Philippine languages. Finally

1. It would be advisable for anyone interested in botanical terms to double check the identifications given in R with the most recent updated classifications provided in Madulid (2002).

there were about thirty Spanish borrowings that do not appear in G. A few variant forms, obsolete terms, and Spanish borrowings found in G do not appear in R.

The introductory material to the dictionary provides information on the orthography, a chart of the Ilokano pre-Hispanic syllabary, and an affix cross-reference list, containing some 400 prefixes and prefixal combinations, fourteen suffixes and suffix-enclitic combinations, nine infixes and infixal combinations, and forty-four enclitics and enclitic combinations. No functional explanations or meanings are provided in the list, although each of the affixes and the clitics, as well as some of their combinatorial possibilities, appear as entries in the dictionary with appropriate explanations of their meanings and distributions. The list also includes a summary statement of the reduplication patterns in Ilokano. With reference to the CV- pattern, R states, "When a reduplicated root results in an open syllable of CV structure, the vowel of the open reduplicated syllable is lengthened with inherent secondary stress" (xxxii). This is only true, however, of those reduplicative functions that developed from *CVC-, in which the original final C was a glottal stop or a glide (xvii), and resulted in a pattern in which the vowel carried length and secondary stress. There are other CV- reduplications in Ilokano, such as many noun plurals and verbs having plural actors (xlv), that do not have vowel length.

The orthographic notes explain the difference between the traditional orthography, which was based on Spanish, and that used in the dictionary, which R claims is the standardized alphabet of the Tagalog language as used in the magazine *Bannawag*. One of the major differences between the two orthographies that R does not mention is the representation of semivowels. In Tagalog, unstressed high front and back vowels are always followed by the appropriate semivowel before a stressed vowel (e.g., Tag *liyád*, 'bent backwards', Tag *bawáya* 'crocodile'), whereas in Ilokano they never are (e.g., Ilk *liád* 'bent backwards', Ilk *búya* 'crocodile'). In other words, in Tagalog the canonical structure of the syllable is represented orthographically, while in Ilokano it is not. There are no phonemic vowel clusters in Ilokano. R notes that every syllable in Ilokano has a consonantal onset (xxxviii).

A further difference between the two orthographies is their representation of stress. In newspapers, magazines, and literary works, writers typically never represent stress, even though in both languages stress is phonemically contrastive. Nevertheless, official Tagalog orthographic conventions are to represent stress only on final syllables. A word without a stress mark is stressed on the penultimate syllable. In Ilokano, R represents stress wherever it occurs, but only on the headword of each entry.

In both Tagalog and Ilokano, a contrast has developed between the two back vowels, *u* and *o*, primarily as the result of the introduction of Spanish loans with an *o* vowel. However, while Tagalog typically maintains an orthographic rule that *o* only appears in (non-Spanish) words in ultimate syllables, and *u* elsewhere, there seems to be no attempt to maintain a regular orthographic rule for their use in Ilokano, despite R's claim (389) that this is one of the conventions typically used. Generally (but by no means always) in the dictionary, nonfinal stressed or unstressed back vowels in native Ilokano words are represented as either *u* or *ú* (but note *goró*, *ólang*, *oríles*, *pokló*, etc.) except when followed by a suffix *-en*, or *-an* (*panguloten*, *katataoan*), but

in final syllables, a stressed back vowel is sometimes represented as *ó* (*asók*, *aggudgód*, *ditóy*, *kutkót*, *nabsóg*, *rusrós*, *saó*, *sallóy*, etc.), but sometimes as *ú* (*abút*, *apíy*, *dalús*, *gudgúd*, *kibút*, *katút*, *kuskús*, *rutrút*, etc.). It is unfortunate that R did not take the opportunity to regularize the representation of these vowels, one way or another, because a dictionary such as this often becomes the standard that writers (and language learners) use when deciding how to spell a given word. It should be noted that *o* and *u* are alphabetized together in the dictionary between *ng* and *p*.

R is careful to be explicit about the phonemic status of glottal stop in Ilokano. He claims that, even though not represented initially or between sequences of vowels in which the first is a high vowel, there is an underlying glottal stop that frequently appears in reduplication and other phonological processes.

R provides a brief statement of Ilokano morphophonemics. However, some of his statements need clarification. Specifically, he states that “in a few cases, high frequency roots with *t/d* onsets preceding an unstressed vowel may lose a syllable (*starred forms are not synchronically parsable)” (xxxviii). To support this statement, he provides the following examples.

1. manggéd	maN- teggéd	‘work’
2. panggedán	paN- teggéd -an	‘employment’
3. mangngég	maN- dengngég	‘ear, listen’
4. makangég (sic) ²	maka- dengngég	‘be able to hear’
5. panggegán	paN- dengngég -an	‘insinuate, hint’
6. mambi	maN- tibbí	‘cotton spinner’
7. pagpagténg	pag- CVC- daténg	‘experiences’
8. mapagténg	mapag- daténg	‘experience, undergo’
9. makagténg	maka(pa)g- daténg	‘be able to arrive’
10. pamkuátan	paN- *takkuát -an ³	‘reason for doing’
11. pambár	paN- *tebbár	‘excuse’

The difficulty that R has in correctly characterizing the morphophonemic changes in these forms stems from two factors, one a failure to recognize certain regular assimilative and dissimilative changes that are operating, the other his requirement that affixation operate on roots whose medial consonants are already geminated following the unstressed schwa vowel. As can be seen from the restatement below, if one treats the base form for affixation as being without that gemination, quite natural morphophonemic statements account for all of the data. The gemination of a root-medial consonant following schwa is a regular process in Ilokano that apparently developed after the three processes described below in (1–3) were already operating in the language: (1) the final nasal (N) of *maN-* and *paN-* assimilates to the point of articulation of the following consonant, with deletion of that consonant after assimilation, as in 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, and 11; (2) an unstressed first vowel (usually schwa) of the base is deleted, resulting in a medial consonant cluster (all examples); (3) the initial consonant of the cluster either assimilates or dissimilates to the following consonant according to the following rules; (3a) if the sequence begins with a nasal consonant, the nasal assimilates to the point of articulation of a following voiced

2. The form should be *makangngég*.

3. The associated root form here should not be *takkuát*, but *pekkúát* (p. 452).

consonant, as in 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 11, but not in 10, where the nasal is followed by a voiceless consonant; (3b) if the sequence begins with a voiced stop and ends with a nasal consonant, the first consonant assimilates to it, both in point and manner of articulation, as in 4; and (3c) if the sequence consists of a voiced alveolar stop followed by a voiceless stop at the same point of articulation, the first consonant dissimilates to a voiced velar stop, as in 7, 8, and 9.

1. maN-tegéd > man-tegéd > man-egéd > man-ged > mangged
2. paN-tegéd-an > pan-tegéd-an > pan-egéd-an > pan-ged-án > panggedán
3. maN-dengég > man-dengég > man-engég > man-ngég > mangngég
4. maka-dengég > maka-dngég > makangngég
5. paN-dengég-an > pan-dengég-an > pan-engég-an > pan-ngeg-án > pangngegán
6. maN-tebí > man-tebí > man-ebí > man-bí > mambi⁴
7. pagpa-daténg⁵ > pagpa-dténg > pagpagténg
8. mapa-daténg > mapa-dténg > mapagténg
9. maka-daténg > maka-dténg > makagténg
10. paN-pekuát-an > pam-pekuát-an > pam-ekuát-an > pam-kuát-an > pamkuátan
11. paN-tebár > pan-tebár > pan-ebár > pan-bár > pambár

Grammar outline. The grammar outline is a highly abbreviated summary of R's doctoral dissertation (Rubino 1997). He doesn't state his theoretical orientation, but it appears to be somewhat eclectic, with the inevitable inconsistencies that such approaches produce. Although R breaks from traditional descriptions of Philippine languages by analyzing Ilokano as ergative, noting, for example, the distinction between the absolutive (or nominative), and ergative (or genitive) pronouns, in many respects his analysis follows the more traditional analyses. He follows these analyses in referring to Ilokano verb classes as "focus types," and claiming that verbs assign "focus" to their absolutive nominal argument. This is a position that has traditionally been considered to be a syntactic process of voice assignment. But R then restates the nature of focus by noting more accurately that the verbs are classified in "semantic terms, by the semantic relationship between the verb and the role of the referent indicated by their absolutive argument" (lxi). He follows more modern approaches by noting that all six verb classes⁶ that have a "nonactor" absolutive argument are transitive, while the others are either intransitive or detransitive.

He follows the traditional analysis that shows Ilokano as having a class of adjectives distinct from nouns and verbs, and states that adjectives and nouns can occur in any order as long as they are separated from each other by a "ligature" (*ng*)*a*. This analysis, however, allows "adjectives" to immediately follow an article or a demonstrative, a position that he notes elsewhere⁷ is "nominal" and thus would require that his adjectives, at least in this position, be nouns. It also ignores the fact that all struc-

4. The associated form *tibbi* is the result of regular assimilation of an initial unstressed schwa preceding a high vowel in the following syllable, after regular gemination of a root medial consonant following schwa (thus *tebí* > *tebbí* > *tibbí*).

5. The form of this base must have originally been *deténg* (from whence also *dunténg*, *datngán*, etc.), because unstressed *a* vowels are not normally deleted on affixation in Ilokano.

6. R labels these "focus" types: patient, directional, theme, benefactive, instrumental, and comitative.

7. "Any lexeme in a nominal position (i.e., after an article or demonstrative) functions as a noun." (xlvihi).

tures following the ligature in nominal phrases have the structure of relative clauses dependent on a preceding head noun. Numbers are listed as a separate word class, but he also notes that they can occur as adjectives.

Dictionary. Each of the headwords in the dictionary is followed by an abbreviation giving either its word class (adj, adv, art, conj, dem, interrog, interj, n, num, part, pron, v, etc.), its status in the language (obsolete, colloquial, vulgar, literary, etc.), or its provenance (Spanish, English, Tagalog, Ibaloi, etc.). For forms with limited distribution within the Ilokano-speaking areas, R notes that it has a regional distribution, but without specifying the actual area(s) where the form is used. A large number of prefixed forms that result from some sort of morphophonemic change of the root word appear as headwords. These typically have their source forms specified (but frequently without the stressed syllable being indicated). Following the definition, one or more forms that are synonymous or have some semantic similarity to the headword are provided in parentheses. One, and sometimes several, examples, often apparently drawn from literature, are provided for a large percentage of the forms. A set of semantically similar forms in a few of the other languages of the Philippines is given at the end of the entry in square brackets.

Unaffixed forms for which meanings can be provided appear initially in an entry, followed by any derived forms, with their meanings. Common derivations are given for most verbs, as well as various nominalized forms and their meaning.

Although it is clear that R attempted to provide separate entries for homonymous forms, as, for example, the four subscripted entries each for *buttó*, *saksák*, etc., large numbers of forms that are clearly unrelated semantically appear together under a single headword, separated by semicolons, as *ábong* 'hut; school of mudfish'. The derived forms that are listed for this root are all semantically related to 'hut', and have nothing to do with the second meaning. Similarly, *barkés* 'a skin disease, usually caught on the waist with blisters', has one derived form with a related meaning, *agbarkes* 'to be afflicted with the *barkés* skin disease', but two other derived forms, neither of which has anything to do with skin disease: *barkesen* 'to tie into a bundle', and *binarkes* 'six bundles of *palay* bundled into one'. This follows the style of entry given in V. G was more careful to distinguish such homophonous forms. Compare the latter entry with that given by G: *barkés* (his definitions are identical to those in V) 1. 'an inflammatory disease of the skin, often originating at the waist, and characterized by the presence of redness and itching and discharge of a watery exudation; probably a kind of eczema or herpes'; *agbarkés* 'to be afflicted with such kind of skin disease'. *barkés* 2. *barkesén* 'to tie into one bundle'; *binarkés* 'a big bundle of *palay* composed of six small ones'.

Perhaps because of the necessity to restrict the size of the dictionary, R has eliminated from his definitions any explanatory material relating to the form and function of cultural items, material that is prevalent in V (and also in G). For example, in R, *burnáy* is defined simply as 'a kind of deep jar', while in V it is 'a kind of vase or jar, a deep strong broad-mouthed vessel of earthenware, rounded, with a flat bottom and usually of greater depth than width; it is commonly used to hold water for cleaning purposes, but several commodities, as sugar, *bási*, etc. are very often sold by the *burnáy*'. Like-

wise, in R, *adaw*: *innadaw* is defined simply as ‘a children’s finger game’, while in V, nineteen lines are provided detailing how the game is played. In R, *bantak* is ‘a raft with sail used in fishing’. V, however, provides a detailed description of the shape of the sail and the way it is attached to the raft. Similarly, definitions of plants are abbreviated in R. Thus, while R describes *bangar* as ‘a kind of tree with bad-smelling flowers, *Sterculia foetida*’, V describes the color of the flowers and the fact that the fruit is edible when young and yields a kind of oil used for lighting and dyeing purposes.

In general, the work is well edited, but as is inevitable, typographical errors appear sporadically throughout the dictionary, and there are a few mistaken translations and analyses as well, such as the following: (xxxv, l. 3) *Pagabbarúgnak* is mistranslated as ‘She reaches up to my chest.’ It should be ‘I reach up to her chest’ (the former translates *Pagabbarúngko isúna*); (xxxvi, l. 14) *ag-al-al-ál* [ʔag.ʔal.ʔal.ʔal] should be *agal-al-al* [ʔa.gal.ʔal.ʔal] ‘panting’; (liii, last line) *balásáng* should be stressed on the penultimate syllable, *balásang*; (lxxxiv, l. 22) the translation of *Maawátanka úray dímon baliksén* should be ‘I understand you although you don’t verbalize it’; (17, entry *-ak*) the *-ak* ending on nominalizations is said to be a combination of the first singular enclitic [nominative] pronoun *-ak* and the suffix *-an* (it is, in fact, the combination of the genitive enclitic first person pronoun *-ko* and the suffix *-an*; the correct analysis of *-am* is given as the combination of the genitive enclitic second-person pronoun *-mo* and the suffix *-an*).

In sum, despite the critical comments provided above, I believe this dictionary deserves a place on the shelves of anyone interested in the Ilokano language. It does not have the lexicographic sophistication of Newell’s Batad Ifugao dictionary (Newell 1993), nor the extensive coverage of Wolff’s Cebuano Visayan dictionary (Wolff 1972). Nevertheless, it is a handy reference guide to the syntax, phonology, and lexicon of the language, and its English index is an indispensable aid. But don’t throw out yet your copies of Vanoverbergh and Geladé!

LAWRENCE A. REID
University of Hawai‘i

REFERENCES

- Carro, Andrés. 1888. *Vocabulario Iloco-Español*. Manila: Estab. Tipolitográfico de M. Pérez e Hijo.
- Geladé, George P. 1993. *Ilokano-English dictionary*. Quezon City, Philippines: CICM Missionaries, Inc.
- Madulid, Domingo. 2002. *Dictionary of Philippine Plant Names*. 2 vols. Manila: Bookmark, Inc.
- Newell, Leonard E., compiler, with Francis Bon’og Poligon, consultant. 1993. *Batad Ifugao dictionary with ethnographic notes*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Rubino, Carl R. G. 1997. A reference grammar of Ilocano. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Vanoverbergh, Morice. 1956. *Iloko-English dictionary*. A translated, augmented, and revised version of Andrés Carro (1888). Baguio City, Philippines: Catholic School Press.
- Wolff, John U., compiler. 1972. *A dictionary of Cebuano Visayan*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph Issue No. 4. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.